**mississippi department of
Information Technology Services**

RFP Questions and Clarifications Memorandum

To: Vendors Responding to RFP Number 3755 for the Mississippi Department of Transportation (MDOT)

From: Craig P. Orgeron, Ph.D.

Date: August 22, 2014

Subject: Responses to Questions Submitted

Contact Name: Donna Hamilton

Contact Phone Number: 601-432-8114

Contact E-mail Address: Donna.Hamilton@its.ms.gov

RFP Number 3755 is hereby amended as follows:

1.   Section VII, Item 14.4 is modified to read:

SAMSv2 will include a data layer of Intersection points that are searchable by Intersection ID, Route ID, Route Name, Concurrent Route Names, and Route Aliases. MDOT is in the process of creating an intersections data layer that can be automatically updated with roadway changes, but maintain the same intersection IDs over time. This ~~will~~ may be part of the MLRS. The Vendor must describe the proposed approach to linking to and using that data in SAMSv2 and CETv2. The Vendor may provide recommendations on the content and structure of the intersections data to facilitate its creation, maintenance, and use.

The following questions were submitted to ITS and are being presented as they were submitted, except to remove any reference to a specific vendor. This information should assist you in formulating your response.

Question 1:   ITS RFP Response Checklist
Is the State open to the use of USB flash drives in lieu of CD's? Does the State have a preference one way or the other?

Response: Yes, a USB flash drive is acceptable. The State has no preference between CD and USB flash drive.

Question 2:   Section II, Item 9.5
In terms of tabbing our Response, does the State wish for each Subsection to be tabbed, of which there are numerous, or is tabbing the major Sections such as

---

"Technical", "Cost", "Appendix XX", etc. sufficient? What is the State's preference?

Response: **The State prefers that major Sections are tabbed.**

Question 3:   **Section IV, Items 7.4 and 7.8**
Does 7.4 preclude the payment of late charges, or are late charges allowed up to the 1.5%/month mentioned in 7.8?

Response: **Section IV, Item 7.4 does not preclude the payment of late charges. As Item 7.8 states, late charges may not exceed 1.5% on any unpaid balance from the expiration of said period until payment is delivered.**

Question 4:   **Section IV, Item 13.3**
Does MS DOT utilize SAAS and if so is it a requirement for this contract?

Response: **Yes, MDOT used SAAS; more specifically, MDOT uses the successor of SAAS, which is MAGIC. No, the product(s) being delivered in this contract will not interface with MAGIC. The only interaction that the awarded Vendor will have with MAGIC is electronic submittal of invoices, and receipt of electronic payment, and/or similar interactions.**

Question 5:   Can we get access to the MS State Travel allowance schedule? How does it compare to GSA Per Diem Rates?

Response: **The State Travel Manual is located at
http://www.dfa.state.ms.us/Purchasing/Travel/TravelManual.pdf. The State is a separate entity and cannot speak to Federal rates.**

Question 6:   **Section IV, Item 32**
Compliance with Enterprise Security Policy. Can you provide a copy of the Enterprise Security Policy so we can evaluate its contents and incorporate into our response as needed?

Response: **The State cannot provide a copy of the Enterprise Security Policy as part of the response to these questions; however, Vendors interested in receiving a copy of the Enterprise Security Policy can send their request to Donna Hamilton along with their contact information in a separate request as described in Section IV, Item 32.**

Question 7:   **Section IV, Item 37**
Does the performance bond need to cover Phase 1 only, or Phase 1 fixed cost and the estimated costs for Phase 2?

Response: **Phase 1 only.**

Question 8: **Section VII, Item 7.2**
Is the State open to the requested resumes being included as an Appendix as vs. inserted into the State's table format?

Response: **Attaching resumes as an appendix is acceptable. While no resume format is specified, all resumes must meet the criteria described in Section VII, Item 7.2.**

Question 9: **Section VII, Item 24.1**
Will the State consider a FFP proposal for Phase 1 in replacement for the T&M, NTE approach specified in Item 24.1?

Response: **No, the State will not consider FFP proposals. Vendors must propose cost estimates as indicated in Section VII, Item 24.1.**

Question 10: **Section VII, Item 24.1**
Where can the Vendor gain access to the State travel policies and guidelines? Do these policies and guidelines mirror the Federal travel guidelines published by the GSA?

Response: **See the response to Question 5.**

Question 11: **Section VII, Item 26.3**
How will the NTE price for Phase 1 be combined with the Blended Hourly Rate for Phase 2 to derive the total lifecycle cost?

Response: **The Vendor must provide a not-to-exceed cost for providing all deliverables listed in Phase 1. Vendors must also provide hourly rates for each role listed for Phase 2 that will remain fixed for the duration of Phase 2. A decision will be made at MDOT's sole discretion about implementing Phase 2 based on the results of Phase 1. If MDOT decides to move forward, MDOT will work with the awarded Vendor to develop a not-to-exceed project cost using the Phase 2 fixed hourly rates and negotiate a contract for Phase 2.**

Question 12: **Section VII, Item 13.9**
What are the issues with the current Intersection Diagram present in CET that the upcoming version should address?

Response: **See Section VII, Items 21.1 – 21.7. Additional items may be discovered during Phase 1.**

Question 13: **Section VII, Item 14.11**
What is the nature of these new editable elements? Will they be presentable via standard browser fields like checkboxes and drop-down lists or will complex elements like data grids and pop-up dialogs be needed?

Response: **The detailed requirements will be determined during Phase 1.**

Question 14: **Section VII, Item 18.2**

Would the CETv2 be providing access to reports in the SAMSv2 reporting environment or do these need to be integrated into the CETv2's own UI?

Response: **MDOT envisions a single reporting environment that accesses data from SAMSv2, CETv2, and other MDOT systems if need is determined during Phase 1, and that employs an analytical database separate from the transactional databases. However, MDOT is looking for Vendors to propose their best ideas on approaches to reporting.**

Question 15: **Section VII, Item 22.2**
Will all users be running the same resolution (i.e. 1920x1080)? If so, what resolution will that be? Additionally, is it expected that the CETv2's UI be designed to use all available space of both monitors?

Response: **Yes, all users will be running the same resolution. The current resolution is 1920X1200. The current resolution should be considered the minimum resolution for the new system. Yes the UI should be designed to use all available space of both monitors. This response also applies to Section VII, Item 22.1.**

Question 16: **Section VII, Item 13.2**
Does MDOT have a browser standard? Which browser and version?

Response: **MDOT does not have an official browser standard. Internet Explorer Version (up to version 10) and Google Chrome (latest) are the most commonly used browsers at MDOT. If the application is browser based, MDOT prefers a solution that works across browsers and devices. Incorporating HTML 5 and Bootstrap are possible, but not the only, development options to accomplish this.**

Question 17: **Section VII, Item 13.6**
Please list the "other functions" within MDOT that require support.

Response: **Some of the staging processes may be re-usable for crash re-processing. No other systems or functions outside of SAMS and CET currently use the staging processes. MDOT expects that no other systems or functions outside of SAMSv2 and CETv2 will use the staging processes in the future. MDOT is looking for Vendors to propose their best ideas for routing crash data from MDPS, through the cleansing process in CETv2, and into SAMSv2.**

Question 18: **Section VII, Item 13.8**
Does MDOT anticipate that hardware purchases be included in the RFP response? Some state governments negotiate reduced/standard hardware agreements. Is MDOT required to purchase hardware from a specific set of source(s) or list(s)?

Response: **No. MDOT will supply all needed hardware.**

Question 19: **Section VII, Item 13.10**
Are all SAMS and CET users connected to the MDOT network?

Response: **Yes, either directly on the LAN/WAN, via VPN, or via Citrix. All users must have an MDOT Active Directory account.**

Question 20: **Section VII, Item 13.11**
Does MDOT allow browser plug-ins to be installed?

Response: **While MDOT has no strict anti-plug-in policy, the preference is to avoid plug-ins where possible. MDOT is looking for Vendors to propose their best ideas for the overall solution, taking into consideration full life-cycle effort and cost.**

Question 21: **Section VII, Item 14.5**
Please provide a comprehensive list of data sources.

Response: **The preliminary list of data sources is provided in Attachment A. The Detailed Data Review task in Phase 1 will produce the comprehensive list of data resources. MDOT is looking for Vendors to propose their best ideas for making sure that data maintained in other systems are up to date when used by SAMSv2 and CETv2.**

Question 22: **Section VII, Item 14.12**
Please provide a comprehensive list of data elements.

Response: **Some of the data elements are listed or implied in the other requirements listed in Section VII. The comprehensive list will be identified during Phase 1.**

Question 23: **Section VII, Item 18.6**
How many reports does MDOT anticipate creating?

Response: **The number, type, and content of reports will be determined during Phase 1.**

Question 24: **Section VII, Item 22.1**
Is the SAMSv2 user interface expected to be usable on either a single monitor or monitors smaller than 24"?

Response: **It is assumed at this time that all users will have dual 24" monitors. MDOT is looking for Vendors to provide their best ideas regarding the user interface design approach. Detailed requirements for user interface design will be prepared during Phase 1. See also the response to Question 15.**

Question 25: **Section VII, Item 22.2**
Is the CETv2 user interface expected to be usable on either a single monitor or monitors smaller than 24"?

Response: **It is assumed at this time that all users will have dual 24" monitors. MDOT is looking for Vendors to provide their best ideas regarding the user interface design approach. Detailed requirements for user interface design will be prepared during Phase 1. See also the response to Question 15.**

Question 26:   Section VII, Item 8.1
Does analysis extend past the hardware and software directly used by the applications? For example, network path response analysis, competing processes on the servers (applications and databases), switch hardware characteristics, DNS resolution response, server load, etc…

Response: Yes, it can. MDOT is looking for Vendors to provide their best ideas and expertise regarding complete system analysis.

Question 27:   Section VII, Item 13.2
Do supported browsers include those on non-windows based machines (i.e. Safari or Chrome for iPad)?

Response: Yes. See response to Question 16.

Question 28:   Section VII, Item 13.5
What are the current bottlenecks in data input and analysis?

Response: Analytic functions currently access the same database as the operational functions, and this causes performance issues with the operational functions. This may not be the only problem. MDOT is looking for Vendors to provide their best ideas and expertise regarding complete system analysis. Issues will be identified and solutions designed in Phase 1.

Question 29:   Section VII, Item 13.8
Can you describe the current hardware configuration and interconnections? What are equipment details (make, model, and options) for the current hardware? Are there system configuration diagrams available for distribution?

Response: Attachment B to the RFP provides a high-level overview. Solaris and Windows servers are running on configurable VM ware and are hosted at MDOT and ITS. MDOT is looking for Vendors to provide their best ideas, expertise, and approach regarding complete system analysis. Issues will be identified and solutions designed in Phase 1.

Question 30:   Section VII, Item 14.3
If data copying/staging is to be eliminated (linked instead of imported) for MLRS (as described in 13.4) is an automated process still necessary? If so, what is being updated?

Response: A specific automated update process may not be needed. However, changes to the MLRS or other linked data sources may need to trigger re-processing of crash data. MDOT is looking for Vendors to provide their best ideas, expertise, and approach to thoroughly identifying and investigating requirements and designing the solution in Phase 1.

Question 31:   Section VII, Item 14.4
Is the new intersection layer for search purposes only, display purposes only (such as labels) or both search and display purposes?

Response: **Both.**

Question 32: **Section VII, Item 14.9**
Are you describing the ability to dynamically list queryable fields in the application query selection tools? That is changes to the underlying data schema reflect in the application selection list without having to application modify code or configuration parameter values?

Response: **There are some data elements that are currently in the database but are not queryable through the interface. MDOT would like to make these queryable in SAMSv2. There are some data elements that are not currently in the database that MDOT would like to add to the database and make queryable in SAMSv2. In the future, it is likely that other data elements will need to be added to the database, enabled, or disabled. MDOT is looking for Vendors to provide their best ideas, expertise, and approach to understanding the known data element changes in Phase 1, implementing the known data element changes in Phase 2, and building flexibility into the system to allow easier data element changes in the future.**

Question 33: **Section VII, Item 14.11**
Are you describing attribute editing, geometry editing, or both attribute and geometry editing?

Response: **Both.**

Question 34: **Section VII, Item 15.2**
What are the current data grid performance bottle necks? Rendering/Display time? Transition time (page to page)? Data retrieval time? Other?

Response: **MDOT does not have a full understanding of all of the performance issues and their causes. Fully understanding, documenting, and devising solutions for the performance issues are the responsibility of the Vendor in Phase 1. MDOT is looking for Vendors to provide their best ideas, expertise, and approach to investigating, understanding, and documenting the issues, and designing solutions.**

Question 35: **Section VII, Item 16.4**
What is contained in a "homogeneous locations analyses"? example?

Response: **A homogenous locations analysis creates classes of similar locations using input attributes selected by the user. These are then used to identify locations that have higher than normal rates of certain types of crashes, when compared to locations in the same class. See the presentation provided at the Vendor Conference.**

Question 36: **Section VII, Item 18.1**
Are pre-defined reports synonymous with report templates? That is, do pre-defined reports control layout as well as content?

Response: **Yes.**

Question 37: **Section VII, Item 19.2**
This is actual traveled distance as opposed to straight line distance? Does this distance include length added to route due to elevation variances along the route?

Response: **Yes. The measurement will be based on the MLRS road data geometry. The MLRS road data is a combination of multiple datasets. Much of the data was originally collected by driving the routes, which would include variance due to elevation. Over time, some of the data has been modified geometrically, which does not reflect the elevation. In some cases, entire routes have geometric measures only. Because Mississippi is relatively flat, MDOT does not see distance variance due to elevation as a significant issue.**

Question 38: **Section VII, Item 19.8**
Does user-generated polygon persist with subsequent map regenerations such as a zoom or pan?

Response: **Yes.**

Question 39: **Section VII, Item 20.6**
Is list of previously saved queries and result sets displayed just the user's sets? All sets? Are there any privileges/restrictions required to implemented to allow particular users to only see some (but not all) of another person's saved sets?

Response: **Yes, the system should list only the user's saved queries and result sets. There will be administrator users who can read, update, and delete all saved queries and result sets. When saving a query/result set, the user can choose to share it with other users. When retrieving/opening a saved query/result set, the user can view those that have been shared. Other than administrators, a user cannot delete or over-write a saved query/result set that was created by another user.**

Question 40: **Section VII, Item 21.2**
Is there an example of a roadway characteristic that may need recalculation for a relocated crash?

Response: **Currently, the system retrieves certain data elements from the roadway network and assigns them to a crash based on its current location. If the data cleansers move a crash, then the system needs to assign the roadway data for the new location. For example, if a crash is incorrectly located 1,000 feet from an intersection, the speed limit may be 55 and number of lanes may be 1. However, if the crash is moved closer to the intersection, the speed limit may change to 40 and the number of through lanes may change to 2. There may be multiple approaches to solving this problem. MDOT is looking for the Vendor to provide their best ideas, expertise, and approach to thoroughly understanding the requirements and potential solutions.**

Question 41: **Section VII, Item 21.6**

Is this an immediate notification (such as an instant message)? Is there a required notification and response time or can the supervisor read and handle notifications at a later time?

Response: **MDOT expects the detailed requirements to be defined during Phase 1.**

Question 42: Section VIII, Cost Information Submission
Rates are fixed inside of Phase 1 and inside of Phase 2. May rates vary between Phase 1 and Phase 2 to adjust for anticipated volume differences, inflation effects, etc?

Response: **Yes, rates provided for Phase 1 must remain the same for the duration of Phase 1. Rates provided for Phase 2 may be different from those provided for Phase 1. Rates provided for Phase 2 must remain the same for the duration of Phase 2.**

Question 43: Section VIII, Cost Information Submission
How does the State anticipated handling travel expenses for Phase 2? Will the same approach as applies to Phase 1 be used?

Response: **Yes, travel expenses in Phase 2 will be handled the same as in Phase 1 and as described in Section VII, Item 24.1.**

Question 44: Section VIII, Cost Information Submission
How does the State wish a vendor to address estimated costs for any COTS products that the vendor anticipates proposing as part of the Phase 2 system approach? Should they be left out of the proposal at this point, or mentioned and estimated, and if the latter, where and how?

Response: **Only the requested hourly rate information should be provided. Any other anticipated costs or effort estimates for Phase 2 should be left out at this time.**

Question 45: Exhibit A, Standard Contract
Phase 1 pricing table explicitly calls for the enumeration of anticipated travel expenses. Paragraph 3.1 on the left specifically excludes them and indicates that they are included in the rates. Please confirm that the approach in the Phase 1 pricing table is correct.

Response: **Yes, the approach in the Phase 1 pricing table is correct. Note the language in the first paragraph of Exhibit A:** ***"The inclusion of this contract does not preclude ITS from, at its sole discretion, negotiating additional terms and conditions with the selected Vendor(s) specific to the projects covered by this RFP."***

Question 46: Exhibit A, Standard Contract, Article 39
What is the expected warranty period for Phase 1 and for Phase 2, and is there a different warranty expectation for each? Should estimates for warranty expense be included in either the Phase 1 or Phase 2 labor summaries, or will warranty and post warranty support be contracted separately?

Response: **Warranty periods are to be determined. Only the requested hourly rate information should be provided. Any other anticipated costs or effort estimates should be left out at this time.**

Question 47: Exhibit A – Sample Contract Article 39 & Section IV – Legal and Contractual Information #37
Article 39 of the sample contract states "as a condition precedent to the formation of this Agreement, the Contractor must provide a performance bond." However, the Legal and Contractual Information section of the RFP states on p. 24, "the final decision as to the requirement for a performance bond or irrevocable letter of credit will be made upon contract award and is at the State's sole discretion." Please clarify as compliance with the sample contract would be in conflict with p.24 of the RFP.

Response: **The standard contract is provided to allow the Vendor an opportunity to review all terms and conditions that _may_ be required. This project _may_ require a performance bond; therefore, Article 39 is included in the standard contract so that the Vendor may review prior to submitting a response. Please see Section IV, Item 1, if the Vendor cannot comply with any term or condition of the Standard Contract, Vendor must list and explain each specific exception on the _Proposal Exception Summary Form_ included in Section V.**

Question 48: Vendor Conference, Powerpoint
Does MDOT use weather data in conjunction with the other layers to assist with the safety analysis?

Response: **Not at this time, but that possibility can be investigated during Phase 1.**

Question 49: Vendor Conference, Powerpoint
Does MDOT classify locations or group by pavement condition data (e.g. skid data)?

Response: **Not at this time, but that possibility can be investigated during Phase 1.**

Question 50: Would the State please identify the vendor responsible for developing the current version of SAMS?

Response: **The current version of SAMS was developed by GeoDecisions.**

RFP responses are due September 4, 2014, at 3:00 p.m. (Central Time).

If you have any questions concerning the information above or if we can be of further assistance, please contact Donna Hamilton at 601-432-8114 or via email at Donna.Hamilton@its.ms.gov.

cc: ITS Project File Number 41020